

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of : **Confirmation No. 2117**  
Keiji SUGIYAMA, et al. : Attorney Docket No. 2006\_0094A  
Serial No. 10/567,685 : Group Art Unit 2161  
Filed February 9, 2006 : Examiner Ajith Jacob  
  
INFORMATION NOTIFICATION APPARATUS AND INFORMATION NOTIFICATION METHOD : **Mail Stop Amendment**

---

**INTERVIEW SUMMARY**

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

Pursuant to 37 CFR 1.133(b), the Applicants make of record the telephone interview (hereafter “interview”) conducted in the above-identified application. An interview was conducted between Examiner Jacob and the Applicants’ representative on December 16, 2008.

During the interview, the present invention as recited in independent claim 1 (i.e., as exemplary independent claim) and the cited prior art were discussed in detail. Additionally, the arguments presented in the response filed on December 15, 2008 were also discussed. It was noted that the Applicants maintain that the cited prior art fails to disclose or suggest at least the features of the present invention noted below.

More specifically, it was noted that nothing in the Hattori reference discloses or suggests a unit to determine whether or not a specific user who received notified information has behaved in a manner indicated in notified information, or a notification that occurs to indicate that the specific user did not behave in the manner indicated in the notified information.

The Hattori reference at ¶ [0172] and ¶ [0173] were discussed. It was noted that these sections of the Hattori reference appear to only disclose or suggest the creation of a user’s

purchase log and includes the use of a list of goods actually purchased. It was further noted that the only notification suggested in the Hattori reference relates to the purchase of goods. For example, updating of the log based on the actual purchase of an item included in the list of goods. Nothing in the Hattori reference appears to disclose or suggest a notification when goods are not purchased.

At the conclusion of the interview, the Examiner acknowledged the differences between the present invention and the Hattori reference. Accordingly, the Examiner indicated that further consideration would be given to the arguments presented in the response filed on December 15, 2008. The Examiner also indicated that it is likely that further search of the prior art would be necessary before making a final determination regarding the allowability of any claims.

Based on the results of the interview, the Applicants respectfully request favorable consideration of the arguments presented in the response filed on December 15, 2008, and withdrawal of the rejections in the outstanding Office Action.

If the Examiner feels there are any issues remaining which must be resolved before the application can be passed to issue, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone in order to resolve such issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Mikitaka TAMAI et al.

/Mark D. Pratt/  
By: 2008.12.17 13:16:41 -05'00'

Mark D. Pratt  
Registration No. 45,794  
Attorney for Applicants

MDP/ats  
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021  
Telephone (202) 721-8200  
Facsimile (202) 721-8250  
December 17, 2008